

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF WEST VIRGINIA  
AT BLUEFIELD

DANIEL DONDREKUS JOHNSON,

Petitioner,

v.

CIVIL ACTION NO. 1:17-03864

WARDEN, USP McCreary,

Respondent.

MEMORANDUM OPINION AND ORDER

Pending before the court is petitioner's petition for a writ of habeas corpus pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2241 and motion to amend sentence. ECF Nos. 1, 24. By Standing Order, the matter was referred to United States Magistrate Judge Dwane L. Tinsley for submission of proposed findings and recommendations ("PF&R") for disposition pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(B). On June 7, 2018, the magistrate judge submitted his PF&R, in which he recommended that the district court deny as moot petitioner's petition and motion to amend sentence and remove the matter from the court's docket. ECF No. 31.

In accordance with the provisions of 28 U.S.C. § 636(b), petitioner was allotted fourteen days, plus three mailing days, in which to file any objections to Magistrate Judge Tinsley's Findings and Recommendation. The failure to file such

objections constitutes a waiver of the right to a de novo review by this court. Snyder v. Ridenour, 889 F.2d 1363 (4th Cir. 1989).

Neither party filed any objections to the PF&R within the seventeen-day period. Accordingly, having reviewed the PF&R, the court hereby adopts the factual and legal analysis contained therein, as follows:

1. Petitioner's petition for a writ of habeas corpus and motion to amend sentence are **DENIED** as moot due to petitioner's release from custody, (ECF Nos. 1, 24); and
2. The Clerk is **DIRECTED** to remove this case from the court's active docket.


Additionally, the court has considered whether to grant a certificate of appealability. See 28 U.S.C. § 2253(c). A certificate will not be granted unless there is "a substantial showing of the denial of a constitutional right." 28 U.S.C. § 2253(c)(2). The standard is satisfied only upon a showing that reasonable jurists would find that any assessment of the constitutional claims by this court is debatable or wrong and that any dispositive procedural ruling is likewise debatable. Miller-El v. Cockrell, 537 U.S. 322, 336-38 (2003); Slack v. McDaniel, 529 U.S. 473, 484 (2000); Rose v. Lee, 252 F.3d 676, 683-84 (4th Cir. 2001). The court concludes that the governing

standard is not satisfied in this instance. Accordingly, the court **DENIES** a certificate of appealability.

The Clerk is further directed to forward a copy of this Memorandum Opinion and Order to counsel of record and petitioner, pro se.

It is **SO ORDERED** this 23rd day of July, 2018.

ENTER:

A handwritten signature in black ink, reading "David A. Faber", is written over a horizontal line.

David A. Faber  
Senior United States District Judge